



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Admistrative Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/772,658	02/05/2004	Yigang Cai	31	5579
40984	7590	05/08/2008	EXAMINER	
WERNER ULRICH			MILLER, BRANDON J	
434 MAPLE STREET				
GLEN ELLYN, IL 60137-3826			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/08/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/772,658	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CAI, YIGANG
	<b>Examiner</b> BRANDON J. MILLER	<b>Art Unit</b> 2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 February 2008.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-11 and 13-21 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-11 and 13-21 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 23 March 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

**DETAILED ACTION**

*Response to Amendment*

*Disposition of Claims*

- I.      Claims 1-11 and 13-21 remain pending in the application.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- II.     Claims 1, 13, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "said called party" in line 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1 recites "wherein the step of performing terminating screening comprises the step of determining whether said called party has allowed calls having characteristics of said call to be completed to said called party; wherein the step of performing terminating screening comprises the step of determining whether said called party has screened calls from said calling party." in lines 12-17. This limitation does not adequately describe the step of performing terminating screening because it is unclear as to whether the step comprises "the step of determining whether said called party has allowed calls having characteristics of said call to be completed to said called party"; or "the step of determining whether said called party has screened calls from said calling party"; or both. The language "wherein the step of performing

terminating screening comprises the step of" indicates that there is only one step involved in performing terminating screening. The limitation renders the claim indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 13 recites the limitation "said called party" in line 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 13 recites the limitation "In a Short Message Service (SMS) or Multimedia Message Service (MMS) center, apparatus for screening an SMS or MMS call, comprising: in an SMS or MMS center for serving a calling party of said call". This language does not adequately describe the apparatus because it is unclear how an apparatus can comprise "in a (SMS) or (MMS) center for serving a calling party of said call". The limitation renders the claim indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 13 recites "determining whether said calling party of said call of may attempt to complete a call to said called party". This language is unclear because it indicates that there are two calls without properly distinguishing one from the other. The limitation renders the claim indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 21 recites the limitation "said called party" in lines 5-6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 21 recites "wherein the step of performing terminating screening comprises the step of determining whether said called party has allowed calls having characteristics of said call

to be completed to said called party; wherein the step of performing terminating screening comprises the step of determining whether said called party has screened calls from said calling party.” in lines 11-16. This limitation does not adequately describe the step of performing terminating screening because it is unclear as to whether the step comprises “the step of determining whether said called party has allowed calls having characteristics of said call to be completed to said called party”; or “the step of determining whether said called party has screened calls from said calling party”; or both. The language “wherein the step of performing terminating screening comprises the step of” indicates that there is only one step involved in performing terminating screening. The limitation renders the claim indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The following art rejection is based on the best possible interpretation of the claim language in light of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

III. Claims 1, 6-7, 9-10, 13, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCann (US 2003/0091170 A1) in view of Zhang et al. (US 7,116,972 B1).

Regarding claim 1 McCann teaches a method of screening a Short Message Service (SMS) or Multimedia Message Service (MMS) call in an SMS or MMS center (see paragraph [0012]). McCann teaches responsive to receipt of an SMS or MMS call in an SMS or MMS center for serving a calling party of said call, performing originating screening using data supplied by said calling party, for determining whether said calling party may attempt to complete a call to said called party (see paragraph [0012]). McCann teaches responsive to determining in the originating SMS or MMS center that said calling party may attempt to complete said call, performing terminating screening using data supplied by said called party, for determining in a SMS or MMS center for serving a called party of said call whether said called party of said call can accept calls from said calling party (see paragraphs [0035] & [0036]). McCann does not specifically teach wherein the step of performing terminating screening comprises the step of determining whether said called party has allowed calls having characteristics of said call to be completed to said called party; and wherein the step of performing terminating screening comprises the step of determining whether said called party has screened calls from the calling party. Zhang teaches wherein the step of performing

terminating screening comprises the step of determining whether said called party has allowed calls having characteristics of said call to be completed to said called party; and wherein the step of performing terminating screening comprises the step of determining whether said called party has screened calls from the calling party (see col. 3, lines 15-32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device in McCann adapt to include wherein the step of performing terminating screening comprises the step of determining whether said called party has allowed calls having characteristics of said call to be completed to said called party; and wherein the step of performing terminating screening comprises the step of determining whether said called party has screened calls from the calling party because the device in McCann is capable of retrieving or looking up information regarding the called party during a terminating screening process (see McCann, paragraph [0035]) and including the information taught in Zhang would improve McCann's prepaid SMS screening service.

Regarding claim 6 Zhang teaches testing whether the destination number of the called party is in a list of numbers to which the calling party may not complete calls (see col. 3, lines 15-32).

Regarding claim 7 McCann teaches testing whether the calling party may originate a service type of the call (see paragraph [0012], prepaid and postpaid service relates to service type).

Regarding claim 9 McCann and Zhang teach a device as recited in claim 7 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

Regarding claim 10 Zhang teaches testing whether a content classification of the call is one in which the called party is willing to accept (see col. 3, lines 15-32).

Regarding claim 13 McCann in a Short Message Service (SMS) or Multimedia Message Service (MMS) center an apparatus for screening an SMS or MMS call (see paragraph [0012]). McCann teaches in an SMS or MMS center for serving a calling party of said call, responsive to receipt of an SMS or MMS call, performing originating screening using data supplied by said calling party, for determining whether said calling party may attempt to complete a call to the called party (see paragraph [0012]). McCann teaches in a SMS or MMS center for serving a called party of the call, means, responsive to determining that the calling party may attempt to complete said call, for performing terminating screening using data supplied by said called party, for determining in a whether said called party of said call can accept calls from said calling party (see paragraphs [0035] & [0036]). McCann does not specifically teach means for performing terminating screening comprises means for determining whether said called party has allowed calls having characteristics of said call to be completed to said called party; and wherein the means for performing terminating screening further comprises means for determining whether the called party has screened calls from said calling party. Zhang teaches means for performing terminating screening comprises means for determining whether said called party has allowed calls having characteristics of said call to be completed to said called party; and wherein the means for performing terminating screening further comprises means for determining whether the called party has screened calls from said calling party (see col. 3, lines 15-32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device in McCann adapt to include means for performing terminating screening comprises means

for determining whether said called party has allowed calls having characteristics of said call to be completed to said called party; and wherein the means for performing terminating screening further comprises means for determining whether the called party has screened calls from said calling party because the device in McCann is capable of retrieving or looking up information regarding the called party during a terminating screening process (see McCann, paragraph [0035]) and including the information taught in Zhang would improve McCann's prepaid SMS screening service.

Regarding claim 21 McCann teaches a method of screening a Short Message Service (SMS) call in an SMS center (see paragraph [0012]). McCann teaches responsive to receipt of an SMS call in an SMS center for serving a calling party of said call, performing originating screening using data supplied by said calling party, for determining whether said calling party may attempt to complete a call to the called party (see paragraph [0012]). McCann teaches responsive to determining in the originating SMS center that said calling party may attempt to complete said call, performing terminating screening using data supplied by said called party, for determining in a SMS center for serving a called party of said call whether said called party of said call can accept calls from said calling party (see paragraphs [0035] & [0036]). McCann does not specifically teach wherein the step of performing terminating screening comprises the step of determining whether said called party has allowed calls having characteristics of said call to be completed to said called party; and wherein the step of performing terminating screening comprises the step of determining whether the called party has screened calls from the calling party. Zhang teaches wherein the step of performing terminating screening comprises the step of determining whether said called party has allowed calls having characteristics of said call

to be completed to said called party; and wherein the step of performing terminating screening comprises the step of determining whether the called party has screened calls from the calling party (see col. 3, lines 15-32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device in McCann adapt to include wherein the step of performing terminating screening comprises the step of determining whether said called party has allowed calls having characteristics of said call to be completed to said called party; and wherein the step of performing terminating screening comprises the step of determining whether the called party has screened calls from the calling party because the device in McCann is capable of retrieving or looking up information regarding the called party during a terminating screening process (see McCann, paragraph [0035]) and including the information taught in Zhang would improve McCann's prepaid SMS screening service.

IV. Claims 2-3 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCann (US 2003/0091170 A1) in view of Zhang et al. (US 7,116,972 B1) and Cast et al. (US 6,975,876 B1).

Regarding claim 2 McCann and Zhang teach a device as recited in claim 1 except for determining the number of destinations which the calling party is attempting to reach; and rejecting the call if the number exceeds a limit defined by a class of service of the calling party. Cast teaches determining the number of destinations which the calling party is attempting to reach; and rejecting the call if the number exceeds a limit defined by a class of service of the calling party (see abstract, col. 40, lines 52-61 and col. 42, lines 3-6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device

adapt to include determining the number of destinations which the calling party is attempting to reach; and rejecting the call if the number exceeds a limit defined by a class of service of the calling party because this would allow for an improved method of screening SMS messages in accordance with user preferences.

Regarding claim 3 McCann, Zhang, and Cast teach a device as recited in claim 2 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

Regarding claim 14 McCann, Zhang, and Cast teach a device as recited in claim 2 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

Regarding claim 15 McCann, Zhang, and Cast teach a device as recited in claim 2 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

V. Claims 4-5 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCann (US 2003/0091170 A1) in view of Zhang et al. (US 7,116,972 B1) and Molnar et al. (US 2002/0168978 A1).

Regarding claim 4 McCann and Zhang teach a device as recited in claim 1 except for testing for geographic allowability of a call to the called party in accordance with a class of service of the calling party. Molnar teaches testing for geographic allowability of a call to the called party in accordance with a class of service of the calling party (see paragraphs [0034] & [0035]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device adapt to include testing for geographic allowability of a call to the called party in accordance with a class of service of the calling party because this would allow for an improved method of screening SMS messages in accordance with user preferences.

Regarding claim 5 McCann and Zhang teach a device as recited in claim 1 except for testing whether the calling party may complete SMS or MMS calls to a roamer; and if the calling party may not complete SMS or MMS calls to a roamer, determining whether the called party is a roamer and blocking the call if the called party is a roamer. Zhang does teach testing whether the calling party may complete SMS or MMS call away from the network; and if the calling party may not complete SMS or MMS calls away from the network blocking the call (see paragraph [0038]). Molnar teaches testing whether the calling party may complete SMS or MMS calls to a roamer (see paragraph [0032]). Molnar teaches and if the calling party may not complete SMS or MMS calls to a roamer, determining whether the called party is a roamer and blocking the call if the called party is a roamer (see paragraphs [0032], [0034] & [0035]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device adapt to include testing whether the calling party may complete SMS or MMS calls to a roamer; and if the calling party may not complete SMS or MMS calls to a roamer, determining whether the called party is a roamer and blocking the call if the called party is a roamer because this would allow for an improved method of screening SMS messages in accordance with user preferences.

Regarding claim 16 McCann, Zhang, and Molnar teach a device as recited in claim 4 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

Regarding claim 17 McCann, Zhang, and Molnar teach a device as recited in claim 5 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

VI. Claims 8 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCann (US 2003/0091170 A1) in view of Zhang et al. (US 7,116,972 B1) and Allison et al. (US 6,819,932 B2).

Regarding claim 8 McCann and Zhang teach a device as recited in claim 1 except for testing whether the keyword, subject, title, or URL of a web page of the SMS or MMS call is on a list of call types which the called party does not wish to receive. Allison teaches testing whether the keyword, subject, title, or URL of a web page of the SMS or MMS call is on a list of call types which the called party does not wish to receive (see abstract, col. 8, lines 45-67 and col. 9, lines 1-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device adapt to include testing whether the keyword, subject, title, or URL of a web page of the SMS or MMS call is on a list of call types which the called party does not wish to receive because this would allow for an improved method of screening SMS messages in accordance with user preferences.

Regarding claim 18 McCann, Zhang, and Allison teach a device as recited in claim 8 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

VII. Claims 11 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCann (US 2003/0091170 A1) in view of Zhang et al. (US 7,116,972 B1) and Kim et al. (US 2005/0020289 A1).

Regarding claim 11 McCann and Zhang teach a device as recited in claim 1 except for determining whether the call identifies a merchant from which the called party does not wish to receive SMS or MMS calls. Kim teaches allowing a user to register an unsolicited phone

number or word that would be used to determine which messages would be deleted (see paragraph [0025]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device adapt to include determining whether the call identifies a merchant from which the called party does not wish to receive SMS or MMS calls because this would allow for an improved method of screening SMS messages in accordance with user preferences.

Regarding claim 19 McCann, Zhang, and Kim teach a device as recited in claim 11 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

Regarding claim 20 McCann and Zhang teach a device as recited in claim 13 except for testing whether a language of the call is one in which the called party is willing to receive. Kim teaches allowing a user to register words that would be used to determine which messages would be blocked or accepted (see paragraphs [0019] & [0025]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device adapt to include testing whether a language of the call is one in which the called party is willing to accept because this would allow for an improved method of screening SMS messages in accordance with user preferences.

#### ***Claim Objections***

VIII. Claim 13 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 13 contains a number of punctuation errors that renders the claim unclear. For example, line 2 should contain the word –an– before the word apparatus; and line 4 should contain the word – for – before the word performing. Appropriate correction is required.

***Response to Arguments***

IX. Applicant's arguments filed 2/13/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claims 1, 13, and 21 the combination of McCann and Zhang teach a device as claimed.

McCann teaches data supplied by the calling party (see paragraph [0012]). The accounting data in the accounting database reads on data supplied by the calling party because the calling party supplies the accounting data that is in the accounting database.

McCann teaches data supplied by the called party (see paragraph [0035]). The accounting data in the accounting database reads on data supplied by the called party because the called party supplies the accounting data that is in the accounting database.

Zhang teaches performing terminating screening (see col. 3, lines 15-32). In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., network switch based terminating screening) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

X. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

#### *Conclusion*

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRANDON J. MILLER whose telephone number is (571)272-7869. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, George Eng can be reached on 571-272-7495. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/George Eng/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617

May 5, 2008

/Brandon J Miller/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2617